

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                          | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR     | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |
|--|----------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| 10/628,773                               | 07/28/2003     | Norbert W. Bischofberger | 234.PC2             | 5777            |
| 25000 75                                 | 590 10/21/2005 |                          | EXAMINER            |                 |
| GILEAD SCIENCES INC                      |                |                          | KANTAMNENI, SHOBHA  |                 |
| 333 LAKESIDE DR<br>FOSTER CITY, CA 94404 |                |                          | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER    |
|  | ,              |                          | 1617                |                 |

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summan   | 10/628,773   | BISCHOFBERGER ET AL.  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit .  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Shobha Kantamneni  | 1617  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appropriate for Reply   | ears on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence address   |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).   | TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE | l.<br>ely filed<br>he mailing date of this communication.<br>D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| ,  | -·<br>action is non-final.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| · _  | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |   |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  | 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul> |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  | 4)  Interview Summary<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Da<br>5)  Notice of Informal Pa  | (PTO-413)   |  |  |  |  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date  | 6) Other:  |   |  |  |  |  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is in response to the application filed on 07/28/2003. Claims 1-13 are pending.

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-10, drawn to a pharmaceutical formulation comprising an enteric protectant and a compound of the formula as in claim 1, classified in class 514, subclass 763, 772.3, 780.
- II. Claims 11-13, drawn to a method of inhibiting the activity of neuraminidase, and a method for treatment of influenza infection employing the pharmaceutical formulation of claim 1, classified in class, subclass 888.

Inventions I to II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case influenza infection can be treated with another materially different product such as Flumadine.

Each above product, and method of using the product relates to a separate and distinct area of pharmaceutical technology. Also each group listed above involves compounds which are recognized in the art as being distinct because of their diverse chemical structure and properties. The search for all inventions would place an undue burden on the office in view of the diversity of compositions, method of using the compositions and the corresponding diversity in the field of search for each. Note that the search involves both patent and non-patent literature. Further, a search for the invention of the groups would not be coextensive because a search indicating the method is novel or unobvious would not extend to a holding that the product itself is novel or unobvious; similarly, a search indicating that the product is known or would have been obvious would not extend to a holding that the method is known or would have been obvious. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

In addition, because of different classification of Groups, for example, Invention I drawn to a pharmaceutical formulation is classified in class 514, subclass 763, 772.3, 780, and Invention II drawn to method of treatment of influenza infection is classified in 514, subclass 888 restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject

Art Unit: 1617

matter, as exemplified by the different classes and subclasses, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one or more claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product

Art Unit: 1617

claims. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

A telephone call to the applicant's agent to request an oral election was not made, due to the complexity of the restriction.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shobha Kantamneni whose telephone number is 571-272-2930. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday on 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shobha Kantamneni Patent Examiner Art Unit:1617

> SHAOJIA A. JIANG, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER

20117/05

\*\*\*